



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In this connection I desire most earnestly to divert to Your Excellency's attention the fact that American capital stands ready to assist in the development of the Djambi fields and other oil deposits in the Netherlands Indies.

In conclusion, I venture to say once more that my government attaches the highest importance to the recognition of the principles of the reciprocity and equal opportunity in the solution of the oil problems, as well as the extension to American capital, organized under Dutch law, of the same privileges and benefits which are granted to other foreign capital similarly organized under the laws of the Netherlands.

THE UNITED STATES AND IRELAND

During the presidential campaign the Republican candidate, Senator Harding, defined his attitude toward the claims of the Irish Republic for formal expression of sympathy by the United States Government in the following terms:

There are two phases of the so-called Irish question in America. Individual sentiment is one thing, and it is recognized that there is a widespread sympathy here for the cause of Irish independence. We voted an expression of that sympathy in the Senate at the time the peace delegates were conferring in Paris.

Official consideration is quite another thing. It is not a question for official America. America has already meddled abroad excessively without invitation. I have said, as I truly believe, that under the provisions of the League of Nations the Irish question is internal or domestic, and I recall distinctly that at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the American advocates of Irish independence bitterly opposed the League as proposed, because it not only closed the door to Ireland, but committed us to the use of force to maintain territorial integrity as it exists today.

Notwithstanding this refusal to accept the point of view of American-Irish promoters of Irish independence, a majority of them are assumed to have voted for Mr. Harding in order to register opposition to the League of Nations.

On the 17th of March, known and celebrated in Boston as Evacuation Day, the issue again took acute form. Under authority vested in them, the commanders of the military and naval forces of the government stationed in and near Boston, who had been invited to order their forces to share in the customary parade, declined so to do because the managers of the parade were planning to give recognition to the Sinn Fein and "Freedom for India" movements. In this neutral attitude the local commanders were supported by Secretaries Weeks and Denby of the navy. Whereupon the following appeal to President Harding was sent by a representative of the Irish-Americans:

To President Harding:

General Ruckman and Admiral Dunn, in press statements today, say that to permit troops to march in partisan demonstrations, especially one unfriendly to another nation, would be a breach of international amity.

Evacuation Day, March 17, is a local demonstration of loyalty and patriotism that no devotee of Toryism, no matter how exalted his position, can stop. Are these officials Americans or satellites of foreign governments? Ruckman and Dunn asked the officials of the Evacuation Day parade if the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic intends to participate in the parade. When they were told "yes," they warned against the parading with them of men in United States uniform, whether in service or reservists. Are they autocrats or is this a democracy? They say no authority can revoke this decree.

It is for Washington to say whether they are supreme. As Americans we demand action in the name of 125,000 citizens of our State now and the revocation of orders from Ruckman and Dunn.

To this letter President Harding, after careful consideration and following consultation with the Cabinet, replied in the following terms:

Your telegram has been called to the attention of the President, and he directs me to say in reply that army and navy commanders have authority to direct the forces under their command. The government raises no issue about the fitness of your celebration of Evacuation Day, and the spirit of St. Patrick's Day is felt throughout our country, but the naval and military forces of the nation can have no part in any demonstration which may be construed as influencing the foreign relations of the Republic.

Comment of the independent press of the country on the incident has indicated marked approval of a decision calculated to assure maintenance of the forms of courtesy and order in Anglo-American relations.

AMERICAN RELIEF

On March 26 President Harding sent to the American Committee for the Relief of Ireland the following letter:

I wish you the fullest measure of success, not only at the great benefit performance at the Metropolitan Opera House on April 3, but in every worthy effort to make a becoming contribution on the part of our people to relieve distress among the women and children in Ireland. The people of America never will be deaf to the call for relief in behalf of suffering humanity, and the knowledge of distress in Ireland makes quick and deep appeal to the more fortunate of our own land where so many of our citizens trace kinship to the Emerald Isle.

DONAL O'CALLAGHAN FORCED TO RETURN

The petition of Donal O'Callaghan, who came to the United States as a stowaway, though being the Mayor of Cork, that he be allowed to remain in this country on the ground of his being a refugee, has been denied by Secretary Hughes. Thus he acquires the status of an alien seaman and must re-ship at an early date. He has been lecturing and speaking throughout the country, favoring the interests of the Irish republic.

Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, late in April, followed an extensive argument, favoring recognition of the Irish republic by the United States, with a resolution to that effect, which will call for square facing of the issue by the national legislators.

PANAMA, COSTA RICA, AND THE UNITED STATES

When we last went to press the State Department had just received from the Republic of Panama a communication the text of which will be found on page 116 of the March issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. It was suspected that it would draw from Secretary Hughes a prompt and unmistakable assertion by the United States that she expected the validity of arbitral awards to be accepted and enforced, and that further delay by Panama would not be looked upon with favor or with leniency.

On March 15 Panama was informed of the position of the United States, and the text of the communication was made

public March 18. We quote some of the more significant sections of the letter:

Both Panama and Costa Rica explicitly agreed to abide by the award. Its conclusive character was defined by Article VII of the treaty as follows:

"Article VII. The award, whatever it be, shall be held as a perfect and compulsory treaty between the high contracting parties. Both high contracting parties bind themselves to the faithful execution of the award and waive all claims against it."

The boundary line between the two republics as finally fixed by the arbitrator shall be deemed the true line, and his determination of the same shall be final, conclusive, and without appeal.

Thereupon a commission of delimitation shall be constituted in the same manner as provided in Article II with respect to the commission of survey, and shall immediately thereafter proceed to mark and delimitate the boundary line, permanently, in accordance with such decision of the arbitrator. Such commission of delimitation shall act under the direction of the arbitrator, who shall settle and determine any dispute as to the same.

The Chief Justice of the United States accordingly determined the boundary lines between Costa Rica and Panama on the Atlantic side. His award was made in 1914. It gave to Costa Rica a portion of the territory claimed by Panama, and to Panama a portion of the territory claimed by Costa Rica.

It would serve no useful purpose to enter into an extended discussion of the reasons which underlay the award of the Chief Justice of the United States, since these reasons are expressed with the utmost clearness in his decision. In an elaborate opinion, the Chief Justice of the United States dealt with the terms of submission, his jurisdiction as arbitrator under the submission, and with the line which should be drawn defining the boundary between Panama and Costa Rica from the Cordillera to the Atlantic. The award of the Chief Justice is definite and unmistakable.

The Government of the United States has noted with deep concern the statement contained in the communication addressed by the Panaman Minister for Foreign Affairs to the American Legation on March 8 to the effect that the action taken by the Government of Panama in retiring its military forces from Coto "should not be interpreted in any case as an implied recognition of the White award, which the executive power, the Legislative Assembly, and the people of Panama have jointly refused to accept since 1914, the year in which it was rendered." This government understands that in refusing to accept the award of the Chief Justice of the United States the Government of Panama has urged that the Chief Justice exceeded his jurisdiction as arbitrator. This government, mindful of its duty to examine this contention in order that it may fully discharge its obligation in the circumstances, and with the utmost regard for the interests of Panama and the earnest desire that her just rights should be maintained, has been unable to find any ground upon which this contention can be advanced.

In dealing with the Loubet award, the Chief Justice of the United States, under the express terms of Article I of the Porras-Anderson Treaty, had regard to the limitation expressed in the letter of His Excellency M. Delcasse of November 23, 1900, to which Article I refers, "that this boundary line must be drawn within the confines of the territory in dispute as determined by the convention of Paris between the Republic of Costa Rica and the Republic of Colombia of January 20, 1886." Finding that "the line of boundary of the previous award from Punta Mona to the Cordillera was not within the matter in dispute or within the disputed territory," as determined by the convention of 1886, the arbitrator treated that line as non-existing, and it was then incumbent upon the arbitrator to substitute a line which was "most in accordance with the correct interpretation and true intention of the former award."

This duty of the arbitrator arising from the treaty was fully recognized in the statement submitted to him on behalf of the Republic of Panama, and it is set forth by the arbitrator in his opinion that his power and duty in this respect were conceded by both parties. The Chief Justice explicitly

adjudged that the boundary between the two countries "most in accordance with the correct interpretation and true intention" of the former award was a line which he defined as starting at the mouth of the Sixaola River, in the Atlantic, and thence, as described, to the point near the ninth degree of north latitude, "beyond Cerro Pando," referred to in Article I of the Porras-Anderson Treaty, and that line was decreed and established as the proper boundary between Panama and Costa Rica on the Atlantic side.

This government finds no basis for the contention that the arbitrator exceeded his powers, and his award, according to the express terms of the Porras-Anderson Treaty, became "a perfect and compulsory treaty between the high contracting parties," and both Panama and Costa Rica bound themselves to its faithful execution and waived all claims against it. They have agreed that "the boundary line between the two republics as finally fixed by the arbitrator shall be deemed the true line and his determination of the same shall be final, conclusive, and without appeal."

The Government of the United States therefore feels compelled to urge upon the Government of Panama, in the most friendly, but most earnest, manner that it conclude, without delay, arrangements with the Government of Costa Rica for the appointment of the Commission of Engineers provided for by the terms of Article VII of the Porras-Anderson Treaty, in order that the boundary line laid down by the decision of Chief Justice White may be physically laid down in a permanent manner and in accordance with the findings of the award.

It is to be hoped that the Government of Panama will recognize that motives of true and impartial friendship for the governments of Panama and Costa Rica prompt the making of these representations to the Government of Panama. The Government of the United States would view with apprehension a continuance of this dispute, which has already given rise to hostilities, with attendant loss of life, if such a continuance were caused by the refusal on the part of the Government of Panama to carry out obligations which it has bound itself solemnly to perform. This government, therefore, deems it its duty to ask that the Government of Panama definitely indicate its intention to comply with the representations made to it by the Government of the United States.

PRESIDENTS PORRAS AND HARDING INTERVENE

In reply to this communication, President Porras, of Panama, in effect appealed over the head of Secretary Hughes to President Harding in the following letter:

PANAMA, *March 19, 1921.*

PRESIDENT HARDING,

White House, Washington:

Demand from State Department that my government would accept White's decision is painful and humiliating. More so when two successive legislatures and all the municipalities in the Republic have petitioned for the rejection of that decision on the ground that the arbitrator notoriously exceeded his jurisdiction, giving to Costa Rica more than what her representative, Peralta, asked from President Loubet, and also because it is against the provisions of Panama's constitution. I appeal, therefore, directly to you, Mr. President, recalling the kind words with which you expressed your friendship and good wishes toward my country when you honored us with your visit in November. I address myself to the magistrate who loves justice and equity, so that my country's cause be better appreciated and that we may be classified among the nations with self-consciousness and dignity that feels herself deeply wounded with the State Department's demand.

I beg of you, Mr. President, to use your personal, political, and administrative influence so that the boundary dispute between Panama and Costa Rica may have a solution more in accord with justice and dignity than the one which we are being asked to accept. We Panamans are confident in your righteousness and we hope that that confidence will not be rewarded with disappointment.

(Signed)

PRESIDENT PORRAS.

To which communication President Harding promptly replied:

MARCH 19, 1921.

To the President of the Republic of Panama:

The communications from our State Department and the Government of Panama and the Government of Costa Rica have been sent with the full knowledge and hearty approval of the Executive. It would be exceedingly distressing to me to believe that the Government of Panama had cause to feel wounded or to assume, for any reason, the Government of the United States is in any way unmindful of our peculiarly friendly relationship, with a recognized mutuality of interest. The friendly expressions made in your presence informally last November are repeated now, and there is deep concern for full justice in the exercise of our friendly relationship. It must be apparent, however, that the decision of the Chief Justice of the United States in an arbitration submitted to him, and reached after exhaustive study and rendered in fullest devotion to justice, must be the unalterable position of this government.

(Signed)

WARREN G. HARDING.

At an extraordinary session of the National Assembly, opening March 29, a committee of seven was appointed to study the note of Secretary Hughes and also a proposed note of reply to it which had been drafted by a large committee of citizens. Five days were assigned as the committee's limit on a report to the Assembly.

President Porras, in his message to the Assembly, said:

The Executive has taken into consideration the gravest situation created as a result of the American note and has drafted a reply which the Foreign Office will submit to the Assembly. This reply has not as yet been forwarded, since the Executive Department considers it as comprising resolutions of vital importance to the country, which cannot be taken by a single governmental department.

The reply discusses with the calmness and respect due the United States Government and people the viewpoints of both governments, and it is presumed that further study of the question by the United States Government will permit the finding of a peaceful and decorous solution, which, while settling forever this lamentable controversy, will at the same time contribute toward the re-establishment of peace between Panama and Costa Rica.

It is necessary in adopting this measure, however, to be counseled by well-understood prudence and patriotism, and that we take into account the alternative which might be the result of the attitude assumed by Panama.

April 7th the Assembly voted to challenge the U. S. position, and in due time this dissent was made known to Secretary Hughes.

On May 2 he informed Panama that:

In the light of the obligation of the Government of Panama, under Article VII of the Porras-Anderson Treaty, requiring the government faithfully to execute the award and to waive all claims against it, and to consider the award as a perfect and compulsory treaty between the governments of Panama and Costa Rica, the Government of the United States cannot consider the suggestion made by the Government of Panama that a plebiscite be held in the territory in dispute as a means of reaching a final settlement of the controversy. For the same reason and also because of the obligations of this government toward the Republic of Panama, the Government of the United States cannot consider offering any suggestions to the Government of Panama other than the recommendations contained in the note of March 16.

This government is glad to receive from the Government of Panama the expression of its appreciation of the friendly purposes of this government and of its confidence in the spirit of justice animating the people of the United States. It is precisely because of its friendship for the Republic of Panama, as well as because of its desire to assure itself that the peace of Central America is maintained on a stable basis guaranteed by the scrupulous observance of international

obligations, that the Government of the United States feels compelled to state that it expects the Government of Panama to take steps promptly to transfer the exercise of jurisdiction from the territory awarded to Costa Rica by the Loubet award, at present occupied by the civil authorities of the Government of Panama, in an orderly manner, to the Government of Costa Rica.

Unless such steps are taken within a reasonable time, the Government of the United States will find itself compelled to proceed in the manner which may be requisite in order that it may assure itself that the exercise of jurisdiction is appropriately transferred and that the boundary line on the Pacific side, as defined in the Loubet award, and on the Atlantic side, as determined by the award of the Chief Justice of the United States, is physically laid down in the manner provided in Articles II and VIII of the Porras-Anderson Treaty.

It is with the utmost regret that the Government of the United States feels itself obliged to communicate to the Government of Panama the determination which it had reached after the most careful and friendly deliberations. Its decision has been arrived at because of the special interest of this government in the Republic of Panama and because of its belief that only by compliance with the reasonable expectations of the Government of the United States in this matter can the welfare of Panama be promoted and its friendly relations with the neighboring republics of America be assured.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

CANADA'S STATESMEN, both those in and out of office, judging by action of the Dominion Parliament following candid debate, do not take precisely the same point of view that Great Britain does of the coming Imperial Conference in June. Canada, it is clear, is in no mood, after her experiences during the war and her participation in the Paris conference that created the League, to let the coming discussions at London be more than consultative. On the contrary, the British Premier and the Downing Street officials count on the conference taking binding action concerning military, naval, and air-defense policies. In addition, steps are to be taken to define the constitution of a new British Commonwealth. When one recalls the political career and affiliations of Sir Richard Borden, the Premier who represented Canada at Paris, it is doubly significant to find him saying:

It does not seem to me that, unless there are unexpected and unforeseen developments, the occasion is altogether inopportune for considering the problems of imperial naval defense or the responsibility to be undertaken by the various parts of the Empire in that respect. Surely we have not undergone untold sacrifices merely to learn that there is to be no respite from the intolerable burden of armaments. Much depends upon the attitude of the United States toward essential co-operation for securing the peace of the world. I am confident that such co-operation will not be withheld, whatever may be the final decision of that country with respect to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The movement for the determination of international differences by peaceful methods has been more important and more marked in the United States during the past quarter of a century than in any other country. Each nation, today, is neighbor to the other. No nation can sit apart. The sufferings involved in the late war extended beyond the bounds of the belligerent nations and affected even neutral nations.